G. F. 73

1923

Department of Board of Revenue

OFFICE Land Revenue & Settlement

STATION Chepauk.

Misc. No. 1580

C 2289/23

Dated 12-5-23

	Date	Initials
Given for copying		
Copied		
Examined		
Signed		
Given for despatch		
Despatched	15-5-	
Indexed		
To be destroyed on		

To whom sent

Pages in the file

SUBJECT.

Village Officers (South Kanara) - Kundapur Tk. - Hakladi Odbagga - Seniority trouble - Patel Appointment at reversion - H. Madappaya

Reversion petition Orders passed

Not to be filled in the case of permanent records

Back Paper.

Dis.	No.	Department. Series.	Date.	Dis.	No.	Department. Series.	Date.

Further Papers.

Dis.	No.	Department Series.	Date	Dis.	No	Department Series	Date.

Mad 24-IV-23

C 2070

The Hon'ble The Members of the Board of Revenue,

Land Revenue, Madras.

BOARD OF REVENUE
MADRAS
24 APR 1923
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

Humble petition of H. Madappaya son of Halsnad Ramappaya, residing at Halsnad in Hakladi village Kundapur Taluk. South Kanara District. Dated the 18 day of April 1923.

Respectfully Sheweth as follows :-

The Hon'ble Board's humble petitioner is a ryot paying an assessment of about Rs. 4000/- and odd. He is also an income-tax assessee who paid Rs. 70/- and odd on account of the assessment of last year. The petitioner's respectability ~~is beyond~~ and influence is beyond dispute. He has been a member of the Taluk and District Boards for the last about 25 years and was Vice President of the Kundapur Taluk Board for about 7 years. He is now the President of the Kundapur Taluk Board for the last about 4 years. He is a Matriculate of the Madras University and has undergone the Karnam's Survey training course.

2. In the remo$t past, the petitioner's ancestors had acquired from the then ruling dynasty at Nagar two Shanbhogueships and one Potailship by paying Rs 1660/- (415 Hoons) as Aramane Kanike which means tribute to the

Palace.) (Please see the enclosed Sannads marked I,II, & III). After the advent of the British Rule, one of the Shanbhogueships slipped away from the family as there were then no male candidates for all the three posts. During the revision of the village Establishment introduced in 1906. the then Divisional Officer was of opinio that one family could not hold two village offices and the petitioner was given the option of choosing any one of them. The petitioner preferred the Potailship and resigned the Shanbhogueship and the Collector accordingly appointed him as Potail of Hakladi.(Please see the enclosed order of the Collector of South Kanara Dis.400/R. Ver.'06 marked IV.)

3. In 1914, the petitioner was elected Vice President of the Kundapur Taluk Board and the then Divisional Officer who was the President of the said Board advised the petitioner to resign the Potailship as his position both as Vice President and as Potail would be rather delicate. The petitioner accordingly resigned the ---- Potailship and his minor son Ramappaya was registered as heir to it and the petitioner's private Gumastha Shanker Naraina Udpa was appointed as deputy.(Please seem the enclosed order of the Tahsildar of Kundapur Taluk Dis No.240 R.Rev.'14 marked V)

4. In the revision of the village Establishme introduced with effect from the 1st December 1922, t petitioner's village No.33 Hakladi and the adjoining village No.34 Shenapur were grouped togethar into a Potail's charge. The petitioner then claimed this ly formed Potailship of the combined charge either f himself or for his brother Sadashivaya if the arrang of registering the minor for the said new Potailship getting the work done by a deputy could not be allow continue. The petitioner's brother Sadashivaya name above is a Graduate of the Madras University and has passed the Pleadership Examination. He has, however, given up practice as a Vakil as the petitioner desire him to do so being in need of his assistance in the management of the vast family properties situated in three Taluks of the District viz, Kundapur, Udipi an Mangalore.

5. The Divisional Officer who made the original sel tion to fill up the newly created Potailship of the combined charge preferred the Potail of Shenapur to either the petitioner or his brother against equity justice and law.(Please see his enclosed Ref.CC 111 marked VI.)

As against the petitioner's

Divisional Officer says nothing nor has he anything to say. With regard to the petitioner's brother's candidature the Divisional Officer admits the superiority of his claim in point of educational and other qualifications. May, the Divisional Officer also says that the Potail of Shenapur has once been punished for bad work. All the same he prefers the Potail of Shenapur on a vague surmise that the petitioner's brother is not a Bona Fide candidate and that no sooner he is appointed than he will apply for long leave on some score or other and allow the minor's deputy, Shankernaraina Udpa to continue.

7. Of the two villages forming the combined charge the petitioner's village No. 33 Hakladi is more important than the other village No.34 Shenapur as can be seen from the following table.

No.and name of each village.		No.33 Hakladi.	No.34.Shenapur
Occupied extent of.	"	Acres.715-94.	Acres.66
Assessment with cesses	"	Rs .3726-2-9.	Rs.332
No.of holdings in	"	201.	160.
No.of inhabited houses in		250.	178.
Population of	"	1446.	919.

In every other case of similar grouping of villages the selection has fallen on the last holder of the Potail

down in G.O.No. 804 Mis.Rev.dated 3-2-91. The petitioner should have therefore been selected in this case as being the last holder of the Potailship of the more important village, Hakladi.

8. In the joint appeal filed before the Collector by the petitioner and his brother, they have completely refuted all the reasons given by the Divisional Officer for not selecting either of them and the Collector does not gainsay any of the points urged in the appeal; but he dismisses the appeal on a new ground namely that neither the petitioner nor his brother is a ' Office/ Holder ' and as such their claims deserved no consideration. (Please see the enclosed order of the Collector D.Dis.No.7863-22 marked VII). With due deference to the Collector the petitioner submits that he is the last office holder the minor being only a registered heir and not a registered holder as the Collector has put it. So far as the petitioner is concerne the ground on which the Collector bases his order therefo fails.

9. Even with regard to the petitioner's brother th Collector has erred in thinking that none but the last office holder are eligible for selection for, B.S.O.48 paragraph 2(i) lays down that the Divisional Office in choosing a person to fill up one of such newly created

village offices should select that individual who is the best qualified in the families of the last holders of the offices to be abolished. The petitioner need hardly submit that his brother named-above comes within this category as is admitted by the Divisional Officer himself.

10. The Potail of Shenapur now selected for the post has had antecedents as the Divisional Officer's own order shows that he was once punished for bad work. Even when he was acting for his father, he had been suspended for three months for grave dereliction of duty in Revenue collections. Further, a perusal of the records of K.R.No. 565/1329 will throw a flood of light on the question whether he is at all a suitable person to be re-appointed to the new Potailship of the amalgamated charge.

11. Last but not the least important, the petitioner submits that it will be extremely unjust to deprive the petitioner and his whole family of this Potailship which is the last relic of the Royal favour to the family bestowed in consideration of the Aramane Kanike or tribute to the Palace.

In conclusion, the petitioner prays most humbly and respectfully that the Hon'ble Board may be graciously pleased to set aside the Collector's order and to appoint the petitioner or his brother to the Potailship of the

for which act of kindness and justice, the petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever remain grateful.

H. Dyavappa 13/4
Petitioner.

Copy has been submitted through the Collector of South Kanara

Documents produced.

I,II,III. Sannads granted by the Nagar Government for two Shanbhogueships and one Potailship.

IV. Copy of the Collector's order Dis.No.400 Rev Ver.'06. dated 20-8-'06.

V. Order received from the Tahsildar of Kundapur Taluk Dis.No.240 R- Rev.'14 dated 20-8-'14.

VI. Copy of the Divisional Officer's Order Ref.C.C. 1118-22 dated 29-11-22.

VII. Copy of the Collector's order D.Dis.No.7863/22 dated 7-2-23.

H. Dyavappa 13/4

C 2070/23 — Q. not pursue

7(a)

Endt. C. 2070 dt 26-4-23

The petitioner has not stamped the petition and enclosures. He shall produce court fee labels of the value of Rs 5, within a fortnight from the date of receipt of this orde

OC

	Rs. as. P.
Petn. —	1- 8-0.
R.D. Order	1- 0-0.
Court's order	0- 8-0.
4 orders of Taln. in Camera after each.	2-0-0
	5-0-0

25.4.23

26/4

To the pet

H. Madappaya,
Son of Halgrad Ramappayya,
residing at Halgrad
Hakladi P/O.
Kinjalpur T/K
D. Kanara D/T

26.4.23

desired
Dr
Please send
to the Section
after drafting
ROs

Proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kundapoor Division.
Dated the 29th November 1922.

Present: M. Sultan Muhi-ud-din Saheb Bahadur.

Read 1). B.F.Misc.No. 1878 dated 28-9-22 received with the Collector's Ref. No. 4446-22-V-6 dated 11-10-22 clubbing certain potel charges and

2. the records of enquiry held in the matter and the Tahsildar's remarks.

Heard Messrs. K.Narasimha Nayath and A.Laxminarayana Rao, B.A B.L., for M.Sadappayya and Mr.N. Narayana Nayath for Ananthacharya.

O R D E R.

The villages grouped in this case are Nakladi and Senapur of Kundapur Taluk and the potels of which are Shankernarayana Udpa and Ananthacharia respectively. The former who is aged 41 years is a Kandavara Brahmin while the latter who is aged 48 years is a Gowda Saraswar Brahmin. Ananthacharia is a permanent potel of 20 years standing and his rival Shankernarayana Udpa counts 8 years acting service as deputy for minor Nagappayya. The minor's claims deserve no consideration under B.S.O.No. 148(ii). The minor's father who is a rich and influential wargdar and who is the President of the Kundapoor Taluk Board requests that his brotner Sadashivaya who is a graduate and who has passed the Pleader's Test may be appointed Potel for the new charge. Ananthacharia is a passed hand but Shankernarayana Udpa was exempted from passing the potels' test. Both of these two potels had been punished once for bad work. Shankernarayana Udpa is a private shanbhogue of Mr. Sadappayya and has no status in life. In service the potel of Senapur is senior to the potel of Nakadi. Shankernarayana Udpa has no preferential claims. Then the question is which of the two viz. Ananthacharia and M.Sadashivayya is efficient & suitable to hold the potelship of the new charge. There is no doubt that Sadashivayya is better of the two in point of educational and property qualifications but the question is whether he will practically do the duties of the potel His brother Mr. Sadappayya resigned his post in favour of his son on the ground that it was inconvenient for him to continue as potel on account of multifarious duties he had to perform. Mr. Sadasiva- ya is a man who gave up the practice as a pleader though it was an independant and more remunerating profession. The fact that he allowed his brother's private shanbhogue viz. the deputy to continue to work for the minor from a very long time shows beyond doubt that he is not a bona-fide candidate. The fact that he has advanced his claims at this juncture shows that he wants the potelship to continue in his family nominally. I would think that no sooner he is appointed than he will apply for long leave on some score or other and make Shankernarayana Udpa to continue to hold the potelship. In these circumstances I do not think that I would be justified in appointing him in preference to Ananthacharia who has served Government for a period of 20 years and whose property qualification is not in any way inadequate. I therefore appoint Ananthacharia to the potelship of the new charge of the combined villages and dispense with the service Shankernarayana Udpa and the minor from 1-12-22.

Sd. M. Sultan Muhi-ud-din.
Revenue Divisional Officer.

True copy

Revenue Divisional Officer

To the Tahsildar of Kundapur Taluk for necessary action.
Shankernarayana Udpa ( ) through the Tahsildar of Kundapur.
Guardian of Minor Nagappayya.

Read the following :—

$\frac{\text{Letter}}{\text{Petition}}$ No. dated 191

From

To

Subject.

Office

Station

$\frac{\text{Endorsement}}{\text{Order}}$ No. *Dated* 191



Proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kundapur.
Dated the 29th November 1922.

.Sultan Muhi-ud-din Saheb Bahadur.

Read 1. R.P.Misc.No.1876 dated 28-9-22 received with the -- Collector's Ref. No.4446-22-V-6 dated 11-10-22 clubbing certain potails charges and

2. the records of enquiry held in the matter and the Tahsildar's remarks.

Heard Messrs.K.Narasimha Kamath and A.Laxminarayana Rao B.A., B.L., for Mr.H.Madappayya and [illegible]arayana Kamath for Ananathacharya

O r d e r.

The villages grouped in this case are Haklodi and Senapur of Kundapur Taluk and the potels of which are Shankernarayana Udpa and Ananthacharya respectively. The former who is aged 41 years is a Kandavara Brahmin while the latter who is aged 48 years is a Gowda Saraswar Brahmin. Ananthacharya is a permanent potel of 20 years' standing and his rival Shankernarayana Udpa counts 8 years acting service as deputy for minor Ramappayya. The minor's claims deserv no reconsideration under R.D.O.No.148 (ii). The minor's father who is a rich and influential wargdar and who is the President of the Kundapoor Taluk Board requests that his brother Sadashivaya who is a graduate and who has passed the Pleader's Test may be appointed potail for the new charge. Ananthacharia is a passed hand, but -- Shankernarayana Udpa was exempted from passing the potels' test. Each of these two potails had been punished once for bad work. -- Shankernarayana Udpa is a private shanbogue of Mr.Madappayya and has no status in life. In service, the potail of Shenapur is senior to the potail of Haklodi. Shankernarayana Udpa has no preferential claims. Then the question is which of the two viz. Ananthacharia and H.Sadashivayya is efficient and suitable to hold the potailship of the new charge. There is no doubt that Sadashivayya is better of the two in point of educational and property qualifications but the question is whether he will practically do the duties of the potail. His brother Mr.Madappayya resigned his post in favour of hi [illegible] for him to continue a[illegible]

potel on account of multifarious duties he had to perform. Mr.Sadasiva-ya is a man who gave up the practice as a pleader though it was an independant and more remunerating profession. The fact that he allowed his brother's private shanbhogue viz. the deputy to continue to work for the minor from a very long time shows beyond doubt that he is not a bona-fide candidate. The fact that he has advanced his claims at this juncture shows that he wants the potelship to continu in his family nominally. I would think that no sooner he is appoin-ed than he will apply for long leave on some score or other and make Shankernarayana Udpa to continue to hold the potelship. In these circumstances I do not think that I would be justified in appointin. him in preference to Ananthacharia who has served Government for a period of 20 years and whose property qualification is not in any way inadequate. I therefore appoint Ananthacharia to the potelshi of the new charge of the combined villages and dispense with the services of Shankernarayana Udpa and the minor from 1-12-22.

(Sd). M.Sultan Muhi-ud-din

Revenue Divisional Officer.

True Copy

(Sd) x x x
Revenue Divisional Of

To the Tahsildar of Kundapur Taluk for necessary actior

Shankernarayana Udpa
Guardian of minor Ramappayya } through the Tahsildar of Kundalur

Exs
CG
4/5/2

D.Dis.No.7665-22.

Proceedings of the Collector of South Kanara, dated the 7th February 1923.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur S.N.V. Rajachar, Avl., B.A.

Read petition dated 18th December 1922 from H.Madappaya and H. Sadasivayya both residing in Hakladi village, Coondapur Taluk.

Read Coondapoor Divisional officer's N.Dis.on C.C.27/23 dated 15th January 1923 and all the connected records.

Heard Vakils Mr. K. Sadasiva Rao for the petitioner and A. Srinivasa Pai for counter petitioner.

Order.

Village officers - Grouping of Headmen's charges Special revision -,Coondapoor Taluk - Hakladi and Shenapur villages - Appeal - Dismissed.

Neither the 1st appellant nor the 2nd appellant is an office-holder' and as such their claims deserve no consideration. The 1st appellant is the father of the minor son --- who is the registered holder and the 2nd appellant is the --- uncle of the minor registered holder. The Divisional ----- Officer has rightly selected the respondent as the suitable man for the potail of the new group, Hakladi and Shenapur. see no reason to interfere with his order. The appeals will be dismissed.

Sd/ S.N.V. Rajachar,
7-2-1923.
Collector

True Copy/

For Collector.

To the appellant through the Tahsildar of Coondapoor.

To the Revenue Divisional officer, Coondapoor with records (one file) returned.

M.D'S.16/2.A.

INDIA COURT FEE INDIA
½R
EIGHT ANNAS

Court fee labels of the value of Rs 5 are hereunto

sent for stamping the petitions and enclosures in response

to the endorsement overleaf.

5/-

Rs 5/-

C 2289

Mr. Crundall
Please register these
sent home this evening
8.5.23

Vol. Munch
The Stamps which
have affixed to Petn & enclosures
8/5/23
Received
8.5.23



REVENUE BOARD OFFICE, MADRAS.

LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

****

M. E. Couchman, Esquire, I.C.S.,

Commissioner of Land Revenue.

****

No. Endt. C.2070, dated the 26th April 1923.

****

Endorsement / Reference thereon No. , dated

Read petition from H. Madappaya, son of Halsnad Ramappaya, residing at Halsnad Hakladi Village, Kundapur taluk, South Kanara district. dated nil.

ENDORSEMENT.

The petitioner has not stamped the petition and enclosures. He should produce [illegible], within a fortnight from the date of receipt of this order.

Petition ~ Rs. 1-8-0
Revenue Divisional Officer's Order ~ ~ ~ 1-0-0
Collr's Order ~ ~ 0-8-0
Tahsildar's orders in Canarese at As.8 each 2-0-0
Rs. 5-0-0

(Sd) A. Appadurai,
Assistant Secretary

To the Petitioner.

Forwarded to the petitioner

(By Order)

Subrahmanya Aiyar
28.4.23

SENIOR SUPERINTENDENT

V.C/28.4.1923.

P 12 C.F. Translation of document at f 12 Cf

/

Order of Mr. B. Manjunatha Baliga, the Tahsildar of Kundapur., to Madapayya, patel of Hakladi Village

Orders have been received from the Divisional Officer that your resignation in respect of your patelship of Hakladi is accepted and that your minor son Ramappayya, who is 5 years old has been registered for the place and one Handadi Sankara narayana Udpa has been appointed to act for the minor till he comes of age and fit for duty. Please inform this to Sankaranarayana Udpa. Dated 30-8-'14,

/Sd/ Manjunatha Baliga,
Tahsildar.

(Translated)

1.5.2.
Manager, Canara Consu
Offic

Vide cf. Translation of the document at p 13 cf

S A N A D I.

2

Orders issued to Venkatesa Malla by Sreemat-Keladi Chennammaji Avergal on the 3rd day of the bright half of the month of Sravana in the year Angirasa.

Mahadeva, the son of Basururu Sura, appeared before me and produced the sale-deed in respect of the Shambogueship executed in his favour by Makaravalli Giriya who had paid to the palace as tribute 120 pagodas. He has also produced the order issued to Giriya in respect of the Shambogueship and prays for the issue of orders in his favour for the office. Receive therefore 120 Pagodas to the palace as tribute from this man and enter in the accounts the name of Mahadeva for the Shambogueship.

(Translated

1.5.28

Translation of the Document at Pls 1-5

~~P.15 C.F.~~

S A N A D II

Order issued to Krishnappa by Srimat Keladi Basavappa Nayakar on the 14th day of the dark half of the month of Magha in the year Pramadni.

Parameswara, the son of Basururu Sura appeared before me and prayed that the Shambogueship may be registered in his name as the previous holders sold away their rights - for want of funds. He also represented that the office which was originally obtained by Giriya on payment of --- 130 pagodas to the place was purchased by his brother -- Mahadeva for 132 pagodas paid to the palace. Please receive from this man 150 pagodas in addition to the amoun already received from his brother Mahadeva and enter his name in the Accounts as the Shambogue and pay regularly the salary of 64 pagodas which has been now finally settled as the pay by adding 6 pagodas to the 18 pagodas that already existed as the pay of the office. This sanad may be entered in the file relating to Shamoogues and returned to him.

(Translated)

Dikshitar
15.2.

Abstract translation of the document at p 17 ef

4

P.17.C.F.

DOCUMENT. III

Sale-deed of Shanbogueship for 150 pagodas executed by Nilivanna

Witnesses- Narasavva. &c

Sale-deed executed with the consent of both parties.

Writer:- Linganna son of Puttappayya.

Note:- This document is very much mutilated and ~~cannot~~ could not therefore be translated in full

Sathianadhan

1.12.23

H. F. LXII-A-19—7-13.

Subject.—

FOR MEMBER.

Village officers (S. Kanara) — Kundapur Tk — Hakladi-Senapur group — Patail Appointment at revision — H. Madappa — Revision petition — Orders passed

READ AGAIN B.P., No. _____, dated _____ 191

" " " _____, " _____ 191

READ ALSO :—

Register No _____, From the _____, No _____, dated _____ 191

" _____ " " Lr. of — C2070/23
Lr. (a) of — Bds' endt. C2070 26-4-23
Lr. of — C2289/23 } R " _____ 191

" _____ " " _____, " _____, " _____ 191

RESOLUTION. (Rev). No. 1060, dated 12-5-~~191~~ 1923

The R.D.O. appointed the Counter-petr as the Patail of the Hakladi-Senapur group newly formed at the revision On appeal the Collector, while confirming the R.D.O's order observed that neither the Board's petitioner nor his brother was an 'office holder' and as such their claims deserved no consideration. The Coll.r's view is not correct. The Board's petitioner being the father of the registered holder of the office of one of the villages grouped, must be treated to be the last office holder for purposes of appointment at revision and his brother is a member of his family. The Board considers that

the Rodd Lawrence's brother (Sadasivayya)
by reason of his social status
& high educational qualifications
is entitled to be elected in
the Cantonment Selection Board No.
1 and accordingly cancels the Order
dated and admits Sadasivayya
as the 3rd on the panel of the new group.

2. The petitioner is referred to
the COAS for orders on his petition
to the Board.

Sd/-
C in C

Sd/-
11/6/23

From
Sd/-
11-6-23

To C/S
Please furnish brief remarks
after end of the enquiry

Sd/-
11-6-23
noted
Sd/-

From Collector of South Kanara
with 5 enclosures to his letter dated
Petitioner's Papers 2 only

If possible, I should like to grant this man's request.

He is a very respectable & useful man, & should see the army.

M.L.
24.IV.02

I should like literal translation of these old documents.

Stamps referred to cannot be found on 17(a) file

Hm
26.4.02

I cannot therefore have stamped. Call for the needful stamps by separate memo & get the translations for which was asked.

Hm
27.4.02

Suppl. Asiatic

With reference to your request to have the documents [illegible] translated by the Solicitor, he is the only Government [illegible]

Hm
27.4.02

Village Officers (S. Nethaji, —
Tk — Hakladi — Senapur group — Headman
Appointment at revision — A. Madappana —
Revision petition.

C 20/23 — W-1 — 1 pf.

Ms
C

A.S.

1 Please see Ms's note & the Secy's direction to Office at pp 1 N. 7. Kanarese documents have been translated — see pp 1 to 4 (B). Stamps required for petn and its enclosures have been separately called for (Encl. at p 7(a) cf) & have not been produced till now. Copy of the R.D.O's order produced by the petr being illegible, a neat copy has been typed for Ms's perusal (pp 8(a) to 8(b) cf). As it is understood that Ms will hand over charge next week, the following note on the merits of the case is submitted for orders:-

2. Non-hereditary & non-statutory.

3. The facts of the case are fully given in the R.D.O's order at pp 8(a) to 8(b) cf. It is seen therefrom that the R.D.O. appointed the Co-petr (a last born) as headman of the new group. On appeal from the petr this brother,

the

the Coll agreed with the R.D.O. and confirmed his order. The petr has come up to the Bd

p 9 cf.

4. The petr's minor son was the ~~regd~~ holder of the headman's office of Hakladi at the time of revisn. On this ground the petr applied for his appointment or that of his brother at the revisn. The petr & his brother are said to be men of high educational qualifications and of high status in life and to own extensive properties. The reasons given by the R.D.O. for passing over their claims ~~are not~~ do not seem to be convincing. The Coll's observation "Neither the 1st appellant (Bd's petr) nor the 2nd appellant (petr's brother) is an 'Office holder' and as such their claim deserve no consideration" is not correct. The petr, being the father of the registered holder of the office of one of the villages grouped, must be treated to be a last office holder for purposes of appointment at revisn, this brother is a member of his family. So either of them is eligible for selection at revisn

p 1 cf. para 2 & 4 para 4.

pp 8(a) & (b) C.F.

The petr does not appear to have been one of the candidates before the R.D.O. He seems to have asked that his brother Sadasivaya should be appointed

p 9 cf.

This view I submit is correct.

JR 5/5/23

The appointment of the counter-petr made by the Local Officers, though not illegal, appears to be perverse. As the post in question is non-hereditary & non-statutory, the Board may if it deems fit, interfere in revision & set aside the Coll's order now contested.

For orders

BSS
5-5-23.

The Coll seems to have been carried away mainly by the impression that the petr's brother Sadasivayya, a graduate and who has also passed the Pleaders' tests, will not seriously take up Potails' post. If Sadasivayya is willing to do so, then between himself and the Potail of Sunapur (Anantacharya) there can be no doubt that Sadasivayya is better qualified.

If the Bd agrees the appeal may be allowed & the ~~Bd's~~ petr Sadasivayya or appts potail of the new group. Otherwise necessity to remit the case to the Coll for further hearing

Jon
5/5/23

The Bd's counter-petr has 20 years permt service & it seems to me that the DDO:

b

decision was in accordance with the consideration which usually govern such cases & that there are no grounds for interference in revision which could not be urged in at least half of the large number of such pets which come up.

There appears to be nothing to show that the Local Officers misunderstood the position (though the Collr was technically wrong in describing the appellants as L.M. & S. Rly officials).

Time, but this is an exceptional case. This coll order will be con- -trolled & Sadasivappa

appr. point of view

(M.L. 7.V.23)

Li
5-V-2

5c
AS.

Submitted for perusal of this order. Draft will be put up on receipt of stamps from the pets.

Bss 7-5-23 Br 9/5/23

may
Draft the petitioner now claiming called for at the same time

Li
8/V

AS.

Draft subd

The stamps were already called for and rec'd yesterday (cf 19 ct)

Bss 9.5.23 Br 11/5/23